

- Realignment of the Stage IV haul road and construction of secondary access roads;
- Relocation of existing power lines consistent with the proposed ROW realignments and HLP construction;
- Relocation of the electrical building, core shed, and production well PW-2a;
- Excavation of new borrow areas and construction of one new growth medium stockpile;
- Installation of the Stage IV HLP conveyor system, associated load out points, ore stockpiles, maintenance road, and utility corridor, including process solutions and fresh water supply pipelines; and
- Changes to closure activities for existing facilities including: altering the open pit safety berm sizes; HLP interim fluid management plans; HLP cover designs; the installation of evaporation cells; and long-term drawdown management.

Under the Permanent Management of PAG Material Outside of the Rochester Pit Alternative, which is the BLM preferred alternative, the proposed activities listed in the Proposed Action would be the same, with the exception of the permanent location of the PAG material. In this alternative the material would be permanently relocated outside of the existing pit.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the proposed Plan modification and there would be no expansion. CRI would continue mining activities under its previously approved plan of operation.

Three other alternatives were considered, but eliminated: (1) Pit Backfill Elevation Alternative; (2) Alternate Location for Stage V HLP Alternative; and (3) Close a Portion of American Canyon Road to Public Access Alternative.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS for the Proposed Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan was published in the **Federal Register** on August 21, 2015 (80 FR 50864). Two open house public meetings were held during the comment period. One hundred and forty two (142) comment letters were received during a 45-day period; however, 135 of those did not contain any substantive comments. The majority of the comments was in support of the project and centered on the local and economic benefits. There were seven comment letters that contained substantive comments, which included concerns about impacts to special status species, especially Preble's shrew, post-closure monitoring and mitigation activities, impacts to water and air, climate

change, and recommendations on the preferred alternative and cultural mitigation. These comments were considered and addressed in Appendix A (Response to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement) of the Final EIS.

On September 21, 2015, during the public scoping of this Draft EIS, the *Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Great Basin Region, including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah* (Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment) was signed. For consistency with the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment, the BLM compared the maps and habitat categories in that document to the initial habitat maps from BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2012-044 (December 27, 2011) that were used in the development of the Draft EIS for the Proposed Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan. According to the new map, approximately 20 acres of proposed disturbance from the Coeur Rochester project would be in General Habitat (versus 168 acres of Preliminary General Habitat analyzed in this Draft EIS) with the remainder now in an Other Habitat category. In other words, the new map in the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment shows less General Habitat within the proposed disturbance area than was analyzed in this Draft EIS under previous guidelines. The analysis and resulting mitigation for Greater Sage-Grouse outlined in Chapter 6 (Mitigation and Monitoring) of this Final EIS are thus consistent with the guidelines outlined in the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment, Appendix F (Regional Mitigation Strategy) and Appendix I (Avoid, Minimize, and Apply Compensatory Mitigation Flowchart.) The preferred alternative includes over 330 acres of mitigation in Sagebrush Focal Areas and prime habitat located in National Conservation Areas and wilderness areas, which would result in a net conservation gain to Sage-grouse, as well as benefit other species.

Comments on the Draft EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Final EIS. Public comments resulted in the addition of clarifying text, but did not significantly change the analysis. Following a 30-day availability and review period, a Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued. The decision reached in the ROD is subject to appeal

to the Interior Board of Land Appeals. The 30-day appeal period begins with the issuance of the ROD.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10.

Steve Sappington,

Field Manager, Humboldt River Field Office.

[FR Doc. 2016-11287 Filed 5-12-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-SERO-RTCA-20896;
PPMPSD1T.Y00000] [PPSESERO10]

Cancellation of June 1, 2016, Meeting of the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Cancellation of meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, (5 U.S.C. Appendix 1-16), that the June 1, 2016, meeting of the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee previously announced in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 81, February 2, 2016, pp. 5481, is cancelled.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jaime Doubek-Racine, Community Planner and Designated Federal Official, Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, Florida Field Office, Southeast Region, 5342 Clark Road, PMB #123, Sarasota, Florida 34233, or via telephone (941) 685-5912.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee was established by Public Law 106-299 to assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River System and provide advice to the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out management responsibilities of the Secretary under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274).

Dated: May 3, 2016.

Alma Rippis,

Chief, Office of Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016-11377 Filed 5-12-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-EE-P